arXiv:1602.04649v1 [math.DS] 15 Feb 2016

CONTINUITY OF HAUSDORFF DIMENSION ACROSS GENERIC DYNAMICAL LAGRANGE AND MARKOV SPECTRA

ALINE CERQUEIRA, CARLOS MATHEUS, AND CARLOS GUSTAVO MOREIRA

ABSTRACT. Let φ_0 be a smooth area-preserving diffeomorphism of a compact surface M and let Λ_0 be a horseshoe of φ_0 with Hausdorff dimension strictly smaller than one. Given a smooth function $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$ and a small smooth area-preserving perturtabion φ of φ_0, let $L_{\varphi,f}$, resp. $M_{\varphi,f}$ be the Lagrange, resp. Markov spectrum of asymptotic highest, resp. highest values of f along the φ-orbits of points in the horseshoe Λ obtained by hyperbolic continuation of Λ_0.

We show that, for generic choices of φ and f, the Hausdorff dimension of the sets $L_{\varphi,f} \cap (-\infty, t)$ vary continuously with $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and, moreover, $M_{\varphi,f} \cap (-\infty, t)$ has the same Hausdorff dimension of $L_{\varphi,f} \cap (-\infty, t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction 1
2. Proof of the main result 5
References 24

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. **Classical Markov and Lagrange spectra.** The origin of the classical Lagrange and Markov spectra lies in Number Theory.

More precisely, given an irrational number $\alpha > 0$, let

$$k(\alpha) := \limsup_{\substack{p,q\to\infty \\ p,q\in\mathbb{N}}} (q|q\alpha - p|)^{-1}$$

be its best constant of Diophantine approximation. The set

$$L := \{k(\alpha) : \alpha \in \mathbb{R} - \mathbb{Q}, \alpha > 0, k(\alpha) < \infty\}$$

Date: February 16, 2016.

Key words and phrases. Hausdorff dimension, horseshoes, Lagrange spectrum, Markov spectrum, surface diffeomorphisms.

A.C. was partially supported by CNPq-Brazil. Also, she thanks the hospitaly of Collège de France and IMPA-Brazil during the preparation of this article.

C.M. was temporarily affiliated to the UMI CNRS-IMPA (UMI 2924) during the final stages of preparation of this work and he is grateful to IMPA-Brazil for the hospitality during this period.

C.G.M. was partially supported by CNPq-Brazil.

consisting of all finite best constants of Diophantine approximations is the so-called *Lagrange spectrum*.

Similarly, the *Markov spectrum*

$$M := \left\{ \left(\inf_{(x,y)\in\mathbb{Z}^2-\{(0,0)\}} |q(x,y)| \right)^{-1} : q(x,y) = ax^2+bxy+cy^2, b^2-4ac = 1 \right\}$$

consists of the reciprocal of the minimal values over non-trivial integer vectors $(x,y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 - \{(0,0)\}$ of indefinite binary quadratic forms $q(x,y)$ with unit discriminant.

These spectra are closely related: it is know that the Lagrange and Markov spectra are closed subsets of $\mathbb{R}$ such that $L \subset M$. The reader can find more informations about the structure of these sets on the classical book [CF] of Cusick and Flahive, but let us just mention that:

- Hurwitz theorem says that $\sqrt{5} = \min L$;
- Markov showed that $L \cap (-\infty, 3) = \{k_1, k_2, \dots\}$ where k_n is an explicit[1] increasing sequence of quadratic surds converging to 3;
- Hall showed that L contains a half-line and Freiman determined the biggest half-line contained in L (namely, $[c, +\infty)$ where $c = \frac{2221564096+283748\sqrt{462}}{491993569} \simeq 4.52782956\dots$);
- Moreira [Mo1] proved that the Hausdorff dimension of $L \cap (-\infty, t)$ varies continuously with $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and, moreover, the sets $L \cap (-\infty, t)$ and $M \cap (-\infty, t)$ have the same Hausdorff dimension for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

For our purposes, it is worth to point out that the Lagrange and Markov spectra have the following *dynamical* interpretation[2] in terms of the continued fraction algorithm.

Denote by $[a_0, a_1, \dots]$ the continued fraction $a_0 + \cfrac{1}{a_1 + \cfrac{1}{\ddots}}$. Let $\Sigma = \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ the space of bi-infinite sequences of positive integers, $\sigma : \Sigma \to \Sigma$ be the shift dynamics $\sigma((a_n)_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}) = (a_{n+1})_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}$, and let $f : \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}$ be the function

$$f((a_n)_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}) = [a_0, a_1, \dots] + [0, a_{-1}, a_{-2}, \dots]$$

Then,

$$L = \left\{ \limsup_{n\to\infty} f(\sigma^n(\underline{\theta})) : \underline{\theta} \in \Sigma \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad M = \left\{ \sup_{n\to\infty} f(\sigma^n(\underline{\theta})) : \underline{\theta} \in \Sigma \right\}$$

In the sequel, we consider the natural generalization of this dynamical version of the classical Lagrange and Markov spectra in the context of horseshoes[3] of smooth

[1] E.g., $k_1 = \sqrt{5}$, $k_2 = 2\sqrt{2}$, $k_3 = \frac{\sqrt{221}}{5}$, etc.

[2] This dynamical interpretation also has a version in terms of the cusp excursions of the geodesic flow on the modular surface $\mathbb{H}/SL(2,\mathbb{Z})$, see [HP] for instance.

[3] I.e., a non-empty compact invariant hyperbolic set of saddle type which is transitive, locally maximal, and not reduced to a periodic orbit (cf. [PT] for more details).

diffeomorphisms of compact surfaces. In this setting, our main result (cf. Theorem 1.2 below) will be a dynamical analog of the results of [Mo1] (quoted above) on the continuity of Hausdorff dimension across Lagrange and Markov spectra.

1.2. **Dynamical Markov and Lagrange spectra.** Let M be a surface and consider $\varphi : M \to M$ a C^2-diffeomorphism possessing a horseshoe Λ.

Given $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$ a C^r-function, $r \geq 2$, and $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we define the *dynamical Markov, resp. Lagrange, spectrum* $M_{\varphi,f}$, resp. $L_{\varphi,f}$ as

$$M_{\varphi,f} = \{m_{\varphi,f}(x) : x \in \Lambda\}, \quad \text{resp.} \quad L_{\varphi,f} = \{\ell_{\varphi,f}(x) : x \in \Lambda\}$$

where

$$m_{\varphi,f}(x) := \sup_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f(\varphi^n(x)), \quad \text{resp.} \quad \ell_{\varphi,f}(x) = \limsup_{n\to+\infty} f(\varphi^n(x))$$

Remark 1.1. An elementary compactness argument (cf. Remark in Section 3 of [MoRo]) shows that

$$\{\ell_{\varphi,f}(x) : x \in A\} \subset \{m_{\varphi,f}(x) : x \in A\} \subset f(A)$$

whenever $A \subset M$ is a compact φ-invariant subset.

In this paper, we will be interested in the fractal geometry (Hausdorff dimension) of the sets $M_{\varphi,f} \cap (-\infty, t)$ and $L_{\varphi,f} \cap (-\infty, t)$ as $t \in \mathbb{R}$ varies.

For this reason, we will also study the fractal geometry of

$$\Lambda_t := \bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \varphi^{-n}(\{y \in \Lambda : f(y) \leq t\}) = \{x \in \Lambda : m_{\varphi,f}(x) = \sup_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f(\varphi^n(x)) \leq t\}$$

for $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

More precisely, we will consider the following setting (and we refer to Palis-Takens book [PT] for more details). Let us fix a geometrical Markov partition $\{R_a\}_{a\in\mathcal{A}}$ with sufficiently small diameter consisting of rectangles $R_a \simeq I_a^s \times I_a^u$ delimited by compact pieces I_a^s, resp. I_a^u, of stable, resp. unstable, manifolds of certain points of Λ. We define the subset $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{A}^2$ of admissible transitions as the subset of pairs $(a_0, a_1) \in \mathcal{A}^2$ such that $\varphi(R_{a_0}) \cap R_{a_1} \neq \emptyset$. In this way, the dynamics of φ on Λ is topologically conjugated to a Markov shift $\Sigma_{\mathcal{T}} \subset \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ of finite type associated to $\mathcal{T}$.

Next, we recall that the stable and unstable manifolds of Λ can be extended to locally invariant $C^{1+\varepsilon}$-foliations in a neighborhood of Λ for some $\varepsilon > 0$. Therefore, we can use these foliations to define projections $\pi_a^u : R_a \to I_a^s \times \{i_a^u\}$ and $\pi_a^s : R_a \to \{i_a^s\} \times I_a^u$ of the rectangles into the connected components $I_a^s \times \{i_a^u\}$ and $\{i_a^s\} \times I_a^u$ of the stable and unstable boundaries of R_a where $i_a^u \in \partial I_a^u$ and $i_a^s \in \partial I_a^s$ are fixed arbitrarily. Using these projections, we have the stable and unstable Cantor sets

$$K^s = \bigcup_{a\in\mathcal{A}} \pi_a^u(\Lambda \cap R_a) \quad \text{and} \quad K^u = \bigcup_{a\in\mathcal{A}} \pi_a^s(\Lambda \cap R_a)$$

associated to Λ.



FIGURE 1. Geometry of the horseshoe Λ.

The stable and unstable Cantor sets K^s and K^u are $C^{1+\varepsilon}$-dynamically defined / $C^{1+\varepsilon}$-regular Cantor sets, i.e., the $C^{1+\varepsilon}$-maps

$$g_s(\pi^u_{a_1}(y)) = \pi^u_{a_0}(\varphi^{-1}(y))$$

for $y \in R_{a_1} \cap \varphi(R_{a_0})$ and

$$g_u(\pi^s_{a_0}(z)) = \pi^s_{a_1}(\varphi(z))$$

for $z \in R_{a_0} \cap \varphi^{-1}(R_{a_1})$ are expanding of type $\Sigma_{\mathcal{T}}$ defining K^s and K^u in the sense that

- the domains of g_s and g_u are disjoint unions $\bigsqcup_{(a_0,a_1)\in\mathcal{T}} I^s(a_1,a_0)$ and $\bigsqcup_{(a_0,a_1)\in\mathcal{T}} I^u(a_0,a_1)$ where $I^s(a_1,a_0)$, resp. $I^u(a_0,a_1)$, are compact subintervals of $I^s_{a_1}$, resp. $I^u_{a_0}$;
- for each $(a_0,a_1) \in \mathcal{T}$, the restrictions $g_s|_{I^s(a_0,a_1)}$ and $g_u|_{I^u(a_0,a_1)}$ are $C^{1+\varepsilon}$ diffeomorphisms onto $I^s_{a_0}$ and $I^u_{a_0}$ with $|Dg_s(t)| > 1$, resp. $|Dg_u(t)| > 1$, for all $t \in I^s(a_0,a_1)$, resp. $I^u(a_0,a_1)$ (for appropriate choices of the parametrization of I^s_a and I^u_a);
- K^s, resp. K^u, are the maximal invariant sets associated to g_s, resp. g_u, that is,

$$K^s = \bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}} g_s^{-n}\left(\bigcup_{(a_0,a_1)\in\mathcal{T}} I^s(a_1,a_0)\right) \text{ and } K^u = \bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}} g_u^{-n}\left(\bigcup_{(a_0,a_1)\in\mathcal{T}} I^u(a_0,a_1)\right)$$

Moreover, we will think the intervals I^u_a, resp. I^s_a, $a \in \mathcal{A}$ inside an abstract line so that it makes sense to say that the interval I^u_a, resp. I^s_a, is located to the left or to the right of the interval I^u_b, resp. I^s_b, for $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ (see [PT]).

The stable and unstable Cantor sets K^s and K^u are closely related to the geometry of the horseshoe Λ: for instance, it is well-known that

$$\dim(\Lambda) = \dim(K^s) + \dim(K^u) := d_s + d_u$$

where dim stands for the Hausdorff dimension, and, furthermore, $d_s = d_u$ when φ is conservative, i.e., φ preserves a smooth area form ω.

Partly motivated by this fact, we will study the subsets Λ_t introduced above through its projections

$$K^s_t = \bigcup_{a\in\mathcal{A}} \pi^u_a(\Lambda_t \cap R_a) \text{ and } K^u_t = \bigcup_{a\in\mathcal{A}} \pi^s_a(\Lambda_t \cap R_a)$$

on the stable and unstable Cantor sets of Λ.

1.3. **Statement of the main result.** Using the notations of the previous Subsection, our main result is the following. Let φ_0 be a smooth conservative diffeomorphism of a surface M possessing a horseshoe Λ_0 with Hausdorff dimension $\dim(\Lambda_0) < 1$. Denote by $\mathcal{U}$ a small C^∞ neighborhood of φ_0 in the space $\mathrm{Diff}^\infty_\omega(M)$ of smooth conservative diffeomorphisms of M such that Λ_0 admits a continuation Λ for every $\varphi \in \mathcal{U}$.

Theorem 1.2. *If $\mathcal{U}$ is sufficiently small, then there exists a Baire residual subset $\mathcal{U}^{**} \subset \mathcal{U}$ with the following property. For every $\varphi \in \mathcal{U}^{**}$, there exists a C^r-open and dense subset $\mathcal{R}_{\varphi,\Lambda} \subset C^r(M, \mathbb{R})$ such that the functions*

$$t \mapsto d_s(t) := dim(K^s_t) \quad \text{and} \quad t \mapsto d_u(t) := dim(K^u_t)$$

are continuous and

$$d_s(t) + d_u(t) = 2d_u(t) = dim(L_{\varphi,f} \cap (-\infty, t)) = dim(M_{\varphi,f} \cap (-\infty, t))$$

whenever $f \in \mathcal{R}_{\varphi,\Lambda}$.

Remark 1.3. Our proof of Theorem 1.2 shows that $d_s(t)$, resp. $d_u(t)$, coincide with the box counting dimension of K^s_t, resp. K^u_t.

2. Proof of the main result

In plain terms, our strategy of proof of Theorem 1.2 is very similar to [Mo1]: we want to approximate from inside K^u_t and K^s_t by dynamically defined Cantor sets, resp. Λ_t by subhorseshoes of Λ without losing too much Hausdorff dimension in such a way that the values of f on these approximating objects are controlled from above.

2.1. **Some preliminaries.** Recall that the geometrical description of Λ in terms of the Markov partition $\{R_a\}_{a\in\mathcal{A}}$ has a combinatorial counterpart in terms of the Markov shift $\Sigma = \Sigma_{\mathcal{T}} \subset \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$. In particular, we have a homeomorphism $h : \Lambda \to \Sigma$ conjugating φ to the shift map $\sigma((a_n)_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}) = (a_{n+1})_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}$ and, moreover, we can use h to transfer the function f from Λ to a function (still denoted f) on Σ. In this setting, $h(\Lambda_t) = \Sigma_t$ where

$$\Sigma_t = \{\theta \in \Sigma : \sup_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f(\sigma^n(\theta)) \leq t\}.$$

Given an admissible finite sequence $\alpha = (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in \mathcal{A}^n$ (i.e., $(a_i, a_{i+1}) \in \mathcal{T}$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$), we define

$$I^u(\alpha) = \{x \in K^u : g_u^i(x) \in I^u(a_i, a_{i+1}) \,\forall\, i = 1, \ldots, n-1\}.$$

Similarly, given an admissible finite sequence $\alpha = (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in \mathcal{A}^n$, we define

$$I^s(\alpha^T) =: \{y \in K^s : g_s^i(y) \in I^s(a_i, a_{i-1}) \,\forall\, i = 2, \ldots, n\}.$$

Here, $\alpha^T = (a_n, \ldots, a_1)$ denotes the *transpose* of α.

We say that the *unstable size* $s^{(\mathbf{u})}(\alpha)$ of α is the lenght $|I^u(\alpha)|$ of the interval $I^u(\alpha)$ and the *unstable scale* of α is $r^{(\mathbf{u})}(\alpha) = \lfloor \log(1/s^{(\mathbf{u})}(\alpha)) \rfloor$. Similarly, the *stable size* $s^{(\mathbf{s})}(\alpha)$ is $s^{(\mathbf{s})}(\alpha) = |I^s(\alpha^T)|$ and the *stable scale* of α is $r^{(\mathbf{s})}(\alpha) = \lfloor \log(1/s^{(\mathbf{s})}(\alpha)) \rfloor$.

Remark 2.1. In our context of $C^{1+\varepsilon}$-dynamically defined Cantor sets, we can relate the unstable and stable sizes of α to its length as a word in the alphabet $\mathcal{A}$ via the so-called *bounded distortion property* saying that there exists a constant $c_1 = c_1(\varphi, \Lambda) > 0$ such that:

$$e^{-c_1} \leq \frac{|I^u(\alpha\beta)|}{|I^u(\alpha)| \cdot |I^u(\beta)|} \leq e^{c_1}, \quad e^{-c_1} \leq \frac{|I^s((\alpha\beta)^T)|}{|I^s((\alpha)^T)| \cdot |I^s((\beta)^T)|} \leq e^{c_1}$$

We refer the reader to [PT, p. 59] for more details.

Remark 2.2. In our context of horseshoes of conservative C^2 surface diffeomorphisms, there exists a constant $c_2 = c_2(\varphi, \Lambda) > 0$ such that the stable and unstable sizes of any word α in the alphabet $\mathcal{A}$ satisfy

$$e^{-c_2}|I^s(\alpha)| \leq |I^u(\alpha)| \leq e^{c_2}|I^s(\alpha)|$$

Given $r \in \mathbb{N}$, we define

$$P_r^{(\mathbf{u})} = \{\alpha = (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in \mathcal{A}^n \text{ admissible } : r^{(\mathbf{u})}(\alpha) \geq r \text{ and } r^{(\mathbf{u})}(a_1 \ldots a_{n-1}) < r\},$$

resp.

$$P_r^{(\mathbf{s})} = \{\alpha = (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in \mathcal{A}^n \text{ admissible } : r^{(\mathbf{s})}(\alpha) \geq r \text{ and } r^{(\mathbf{s})}(a_1 \ldots a_{n-1}) < r\},$$

and we consider the sets

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{u}}(t, r) = \{\alpha \in P_r^{(\mathbf{u})} : I^u(\alpha) \cap K_t^u \neq \emptyset\},$$

resp.

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{s}}(t, r) = \{\alpha \in P_r^{(\mathbf{s})} : I^s(\alpha^T) \cap K_t^s \neq \emptyset\}$$

whose cardinalities are denoted by $N_{\mathbf{u}}(t,r) := \#\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{u}}(t,r)$ and $N_{\mathbf{s}}(t,r) := \#\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{s}}(t,r)$.

Lemma 2.3. *For each $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the sequences $N_{\boldsymbol{u}}(t,r)$, $r \in \mathbb{N}$, and $N_{\boldsymbol{s}}(t,r)$, $r \in \mathbb{N}$, are essentially submultiplicative in the sense that there exists a constant $c_3 = c_3(\varphi,\Lambda) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$N_{\boldsymbol{u}}(t,n+m) \leq \#\mathcal{A}^{c_3} \cdot N_{\boldsymbol{u}}(t,n) \cdot N_{\boldsymbol{u}}(t,m)$$

and

$$N_{\boldsymbol{s}}(t,n+m) \leq \#\mathcal{A}^{c_3} \cdot N_{\boldsymbol{s}}(t,n) \cdot N_{\boldsymbol{s}}(t,m)$$

for all $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. By symmetry (i.e., exchanging the roles of φ and φ^{-1}), it suffices to show that the sequence $N_u(t,r)$, $r \in \mathbb{N}$, is essentially submultiplicative.

Since the expanding map g_u defining the Cantor set K^u is $C^{1+\varepsilon}$, the usual bounded distortion property (cf. Remark 2.1) ensures the existence of a constant $c_1 = c_1(\varphi,\Lambda)$ such that the sizes of the intervals $I^u(.)$ behave essentially submultiplicatively under admissible concatenations of words, i.e.,

$$|I^u(\alpha\beta\gamma)| \leq e^{2c_1}|I^u(\alpha)| \cdot |I^u(\beta)| \cdot |I^u(\gamma)|$$

for all α, β, γ finite words such that the concatenation $\alpha\beta\gamma$ is admissible.

Next, we observe that, if $\gamma = \gamma_1 \dots \gamma_c$ is a finite word in the letters $\gamma_i \in \mathcal{A}$, $1 \leq i \leq c$, then

$$|I^u(\gamma)| \leq \frac{1}{\mu^c} \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} |I^u_a|$$

where $\mu = \mu_{\mathbf{u}} := \min |Dg_u| > 1$,

Now, we note that, for each $c \in \mathbb{N}$, one can cover K^u_t with $\leq \#\mathcal{A}^c \cdot N_{\mathbf{u}}(t,n) \cdot N_{\mathbf{u}}(t,m)$ intervals $I^u(\alpha\beta\gamma)$ with $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{u}}(t,n)$, $\beta \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{u}}(t,m)$, $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}^c$ and $\alpha\beta\gamma$ admissible.

Therefore, by taking

$$c_3 = c_3(\varphi,\Lambda) = \lceil \frac{\log(e^{2c_1} \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} |I^u_a|)}{\log \mu} \rceil \in \mathbb{N},$$

it follows that we can cover K^u_t with $\leq \#\mathcal{A}^{c_3} \cdot N_{\mathbf{u}}(t,n) \cdot N_{\mathbf{u}}(t,m)$ intervals $I^u(\alpha\beta\gamma)$ whose scales satisfy

$$r^{(\mathbf{u})}(\alpha\beta\gamma) \geq r^{(\mathbf{u})}(\alpha) + r^{(\mathbf{u})}(\beta) \geq n + m$$

whenever $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{u}}(t,n)$, $\beta \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{u}}(t,m)$, $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}^{c_3}$ and $\alpha\beta\gamma$ is admissible. Hence, we conclude that

$$N_{\mathbf{u}}(t,n+m) \leq \#\mathcal{A}^{c_3} \cdot N_{\mathbf{u}}(t,n) \cdot N_{\mathbf{u}}(t,m)$$

for all $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$. □

From this lemma we get the following immediate corollary:

Corollary 2.4. *For each $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the limits*

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{1}{m} \log N_{\boldsymbol{u}}(t,m) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{1}{m} \log N_{\boldsymbol{s}}(t,m)$$

exist and they coincide with

$$D_u(t) := \inf_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{m} \log(\#\mathcal{A}^{c_3} \cdot N_{\boldsymbol{u}}(t,m)) \quad \text{and} \quad D_s(t) := \inf_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{m} \log(\#\mathcal{A}^{c_3} \cdot N_{\boldsymbol{u}}(t,m))$$

where $c_3 = c_3(\varphi,\Lambda) \in \mathbb{N}$ is the constant introduced in Lemma 2.3.

Remark 2.5. It is not hard to check that $D_u(t)$, resp. $D_s(t)$, coincides with the limit capacity (box counting dimension) of K_t^u, resp. K_t^s.

2.2. **Upper semicontinuity of $D_u(t)$ and $D_s(t)$.** In this subsection we show the upper semicontinuity of the limit capacities of K_t^u and K_t^s;

Proposition 2.6. *Using the notation of Corollary 2.4, the functions $t \mapsto D_u(t)$ and $t \mapsto D_s(t)$ are upper semicontinuous.*

Proof. By symmetry (i.e., exchanging φ by φ^{-1}), our task consists to prove that, for each $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, the values $D_u(t)$ converge to $D_u(t_0)$ as $t > t_0$ approaches t_0.

By contradiction, suppose that this is not the case. Then, there exists $\eta > 0$ such that

$$D_u(t) > D_u(t_0) + \eta$$

for all $t > t_0$. By Corollary 2.4, this implies that

$$\frac{1}{m} \log(\#\mathcal{A}^{c_3} \cdot N_{\mathbf{u}}(t,m)) > D_u(t_0) + \eta$$

for all $t > t_0$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

On the other hand, by compactness, for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, one has

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{u}}(t_0,m) = \bigcap_{t>t_0} \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{u}}(t,m).$$

In particular, for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $t(m) > t_0$ such that $N_{\mathbf{u}}(t(m),m) = N_{\mathbf{u}}(t_0,m)$.

Therefore, by putting these facts together, we would deduce that, for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\frac{1}{m} \log(\#\mathcal{A}^{c_3} \cdot N_{\mathbf{u}}(t_0,m)) = \frac{1}{m} \log(\#\mathcal{A}^{c_3} \cdot N_{\mathbf{u}}(t(m),m)) > D_u(t_0) + \eta$$

Hence, by letting $m \to \infty$, we would conclude that

$$D_u(t_0) > D_u(t_0) + \eta,$$

a contradiction. □

2.3. **Construction of $\mathcal{R}_{\varphi,\Lambda}$.** Fix $r \geq 2$. We define

$$\mathcal{R}_{\varphi,\Lambda} = \{f \in C^r(M,\mathbb{R}) : \nabla f(x) \text{ is not perpendicular to } E^s_x \text{ or } E^u_x \text{ for all } x \in \Lambda\}.$$

In other terms, $\mathcal{R}_{\varphi,\Lambda}$ is the class of C^r-functions $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$ that are locally monotone along stable and unstable directions.

Proposition 2.7. *Fix $r \geq 2$. If the horseshoe Λ has Hausdorff dimension*

$$dim(\Lambda) < 1,$$

then $\mathcal{R}_{\varphi,\Lambda}$ is C^r-open and dense in $C^r(M,\mathbb{R})$.

Proof of Proposition 2.7. For the proof of this proposition we will need the following well-known fact (cf. [PT, p. 162–165] and also [HPS]):

Lemma 2.8. *The maps $\Lambda \ni x \mapsto E^s_x$ and $\Lambda \ni x \mapsto E^u_x$ are C^1.*

Remark 2.9. If the surface diffeomorphism φ is C^3, then the maps $\Lambda \ni x \mapsto E^s_x$ and $\Lambda \ni x \mapsto E^u_x$ are $C^{1+\kappa}$ for some $\kappa > 0$.

Observe that, by definition, the set $\mathcal{R}_{\varphi,\Lambda}$ is C^r-open. Hence, our task is reduced to show that $\mathcal{R}_{\varphi,\Lambda}$ is C^r-dense.

For this sake, let us fix a smooth system of coordinates z on the initial Markov partition $\{R_a\}_{a\in\mathcal{A}}$ so that, given $f \in C^r(M,\mathbb{R})$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, the function $g(z) = f(z) + \langle v, z\rangle$ for $z \in \bigcup_{a\in\mathcal{A}} R_a$ can be extended (via an adequate partition of unity) to a ε-C^r-perturbation of f whenever $v \in \mathbb{R}^2$ has norm $\|v\| \leq \varepsilon$.

Suppose that $f \notin \mathcal{R}_{\varphi,\Lambda}$. Given $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, we will construct $v \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $\|v\| \leq \varepsilon$ and $g(z) = f(z) + \langle v, z\rangle \in \mathcal{R}_{\varphi,\Lambda}$.

For each $\delta > 0$, let us consider the set $\mathcal{C}(\delta)$ of admissible finite words of the form $(a_{-m}, \ldots, a_0, \ldots, a_n)$, $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that the rectangle $R(a_{-m}, \ldots, a_0, \ldots, a_n) = \bigcap_{j=-m}^{n} \varphi^{-j}(R_{a_j})$ has diameter $\leq \delta$ but the rectangles $R(a_{-m}, \ldots, a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1})$ and $R(a_{-m+1}, \ldots, a_0, \ldots, a_n)$ have diameters $> \delta$.

Since Λ is a horseshoe associated to a C^2-diffeomorphism φ, we know that, for each $d > \dim(\Lambda)$, there exists $\delta_0 = \delta_0(d)$ such that

$$\#\mathcal{C}(\delta) \leq 1/\delta^d$$

for all $0 < \delta < \delta_0$.

By assumption, $\dim(\Lambda) < 1$. Thus, we can fix once and for all $\dim(\Lambda) < d < 1$ (e.g., $d = \sqrt{\dim(\Lambda)}$) and the corresponding quantity $\delta_0 = \delta_0(d) > 0$.

Next, let us take $\rho = \rho(f,\Lambda) \geq 1$ such that $|\nabla f(z)| \leq \rho$ for all $z \in \Lambda$. Also, since f is C^2, there exists a constant $c_4 = c_4(f,\Lambda) > 0$ such that

$$|\nabla f(z) - \nabla f(w)| \leq c_4|z - w|$$

for all $z, w \in \Lambda$. Moreover, by Lemma 2.8, there exists a constant $c_5 = c_5(\varphi, \Lambda) > 0$ such that

$$|v^s(z) - v^s(w)| \leq c_5|z - w|$$

and

$$|v^u(z) - v^u(w)| \leq c_5|z - w|$$

where v^s and v^u (resp.) are unitary vectors in E^s and E^u (resp.).

In this setting, for each rectangle $R(\alpha)$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}(\delta)$, such that $\nabla f(z_\alpha)$ is perpendicular to $v^*(z_\alpha)$, $* = s$ or u, for some $z_\alpha \in R(\alpha)$, we write

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \nabla f(z) + v, v^*(z)\rangle &= \langle \nabla f(z) - \nabla f(z_\alpha), v^*(z)\rangle + \langle \nabla f(z_\alpha), v^*(z) - v^*(z_\alpha)\rangle \\ &+ \langle \nabla f(z_\alpha), v^*(z_\alpha)\rangle + \langle v, v^*(z) - v^*(z_\alpha)\rangle + \langle v, v^*(z_\alpha)\rangle\end{aligned}$$

We control this quantity as follows. Since $R(\alpha)$ has diameter $\leq \delta$, we see from our previous discussion that

$$|\langle \nabla f(z) - \nabla f(z_\alpha), v^*(z)\rangle| \leq c_4\delta, \qquad |\langle \nabla f(z_\alpha), v^*(z) - v^*(z_\alpha)\rangle| \leq \rho c_5\delta$$

$$\langle \nabla f(z_\alpha), v^*(z_\alpha)\rangle = 0, \qquad |\langle v, v^*(z) - v^*(z_\alpha)\rangle| \leq \|v\| c_5\delta$$

In particular, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}S_\alpha &:= \{v \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \|v\| \leq \varepsilon, \langle \nabla f(z) + v, v^*(z)\rangle = 0 \text{ for some } z \in R(\alpha)\} \\ &\subset \{v \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \|v\| \leq \varepsilon, \langle v, v^*(z_\alpha)\rangle \leq (c_4 + (\rho+1)c_5)\delta\}\end{aligned}$$

for $0 < \varepsilon < 1$.

Therefore, since the function $g(z) = f(z) + \langle v, z\rangle$ satisfies $\nabla g(z) = \nabla f(z) + v$, the proof of the proposition is complete once we show that there exists $v \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $\|v\| \leq \varepsilon$ and $v \notin \bigcup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{C}(\delta)} S_\alpha$. As it turns out, this fact is not hard to check: by our previous discussion, for all $0 < \delta < \delta_0$, the Lebesgue measure of $\bigcup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{C}(\delta)} S_\alpha$ is

$$\leq (c_4 + (\rho+1)c_5)\delta^{1-d}\varepsilon^2$$

because, for each $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}(\delta)$, the Lebesgue measure of S_α is $\leq (c_4 + (\rho+1)c_5)\delta\varepsilon^2$, and the cardinality of $\mathcal{C}(\delta)$ is $\leq \delta^{-d}$. □

2.4. **Approximation of Λ_t by subhorseshoes.** During this entire subsection we fix a function $f \in \mathcal{R}_{\varphi,\Lambda}$ where $\mathcal{R}_{\varphi,\Lambda}$ was defined in Subsection 2.3 above.

By definition of $\mathcal{R}_{\varphi,\Lambda}$, we can refine the initial Markov partition $\{R_a\}_{a\in\mathcal{A}}$ (if necessary) so that the restriction of f to each of the intervals $\{i_a^s\} \times I_a^u$, $a \in \mathcal{A}$, is monotone (i.e., strictly increasing or decreasing), and, furthermore, for some constant $c_6 = c_6(\varphi, f) > 0$, the following estimates hold:

$$\begin{aligned}&|f(\underline{\theta}^{(1)}a_1 \dots a_n a_{n+1}\underline{\theta}^{(3)}) - f(\underline{\theta}^{(1)}a_1 \dots a_n a'_{n+1}\underline{\theta}^{(4)})| > c_6|I^u(a_1 \dots a_n)|, \\ &|f(\underline{\theta}^{(1)}a_{m+1}a_m \dots a_1\underline{\theta}^{(3)}) - f(\underline{\theta}^{(2)}a'_{m+1}a_m \dots a_1\underline{\theta}^{(3)})| > c_6|I^s(a_m \dots a_1)|\end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

whenever $a_{n+1} \neq a'_{n+1}$, $a_{m+1} \neq a'_{m+1}$ and $\underline{\theta}^{(1)}, \underline{\theta}^{(2)} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}^-}$, $\underline{\theta}^{(3)}, \underline{\theta}^{(4)} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$ are admissible.

Moreover, we observe that, since f is Lipschitz (actually $f \in C^2$), there exists $c_7 = c_7(\varphi, f) > 0$ such that one also has the following estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} &|f(\underline{\theta}^{(1)} a_1 \dots a_n a_{n+1} \underline{\theta}^{(3)}) - f(\underline{\theta}^{(1)} a_1 \dots a_n a'_{n+1} \underline{\theta}^{(4)})| < c_7 |I^u(a_1 \dots a_n)|, \\ &|f(\underline{\theta}^{(1)} a_{m+1} a_m \dots a_1 \underline{\theta}^{(3)}) - f(\underline{\theta}^{(2)} a'_{m+1} a_m \dots a_1 \underline{\theta}^{(3)})| < c_7 |I^s(a_1 \dots a_m)| \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

whenever $a_{n+1} \neq a'_{n+1}$, $a_{m+1} \neq a'_{m+1}$ and $\underline{\theta}^{(1)}, \underline{\theta}^{(2)} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}^-}$, $\underline{\theta}^{(3)}, \underline{\theta}^{(4)} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$ are admissible.

The proof of Theorem 1.2 is based on Proposition 2.6, Proposition 2.7 and the following statement whose proof will occupy the remainder of this subsection.

Proposition 2.10. *Let Λ be a horseshoe of a conservative C^2-diffeomorphism φ of a surface M. Let $f \in \mathcal{R}_{\varphi,\Lambda}$ with $\mathcal{R}_{\varphi,\Lambda}$ as defined in Subsection 2.3, and let us fix $t \in \mathbb{R}$ with $D_{\boldsymbol{u}}(t) > 0$, resp. $D_{\boldsymbol{s}}(t) > 0$.*

Then, for each $0 < \eta < 1$, there exists $\delta > 0$ and a complete subshift $\Sigma(\mathcal{B}_u) \subset \Sigma \subset \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, resp. $\Sigma(\mathcal{B}_s) \subset \Sigma \subset \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, associated to a finite set $\mathcal{B}_u = \{\beta_1^{(u)}, \dots, \beta_m^{(u)}\}$, resp. $\mathcal{B}_s = \{\beta_1^{(s)}, \dots, \beta_n^{(s)}\}$, of finite sequences $\beta_i^{(u)} = (a_1^{(i);u}, \dots, a_{m_i}^{(i);u}) \in \mathcal{A}^{m_i}$, resp. $\beta_i^{(s)} = (a_1^{(i);s}, \dots, a_{n_i}^{(i);s}) \in \mathcal{A}^{n_i}$ such that

$$\Sigma(\mathcal{B}_u) \subset \Sigma_{t-\delta}, \quad \text{resp. } \Sigma(\mathcal{B}_s) \subset \Sigma_{t-\delta},$$

and

$$dim(K^u(\Sigma(\mathcal{B}_u))) > (1-\eta) D_u(t), \quad dim(K^s(\Sigma(\mathcal{B}_u^T))) > (1-\eta) D_u(t)$$

resp.

$$dim(K^s(\Sigma(\mathcal{B}_s))) > (1-\eta) D_s(t), \quad dim(K^u(\Sigma(\mathcal{B}_s^T))) > (1-\eta) D_s(t)$$

where $K^u(\Sigma(*))$, resp. $K^s(\Sigma(*))$, is the subset of K^u, resp. K^s, consisting of points whose trajectory under g_u, resp. g_s, follows an itinerary obtained from the concatenation of words in the alphabet $*$, and $*^T$ is the alphabet whose words are the transposes of the words of the alphabet $*$.

In particular, $D_s(t) = D_u(t) = d_u(t) = d_s(t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Remark 2.11. By symmetry (i.e., exchanging the roles of φ and φ^{-1}), it suffices to exhibit $\mathcal{B}_u$ satisfying the conclusion of Proposition 2.10.

The construction of $\mathcal{B}_u$ depends on the following three combinatorial lemmas (cf. Lemmas 2.13, 2.14 and 2.15 below).

Take $\tau = \eta/100$ and choose $r_0 = r_0(\varphi, f, t, \eta) \in \mathbb{N}$ large so that

$$\left| \frac{\log N_u(t, r)}{r} - D_u(t) \right| < \frac{\tau}{2} D_u(t) \tag{2.3}$$

for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$, $r \geq r_0$.

We set $\mathcal{B}_0 = \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{u}}(t, r_0)$, $N_0 := N_{\mathbf{u}}(t, r_0) = \#\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{u}}(t, r_0)$, $k := 8N_0^2\lceil 2/\tau \rceil$ and

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{B}} = \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_u := \{\beta_1 \dots \beta_k : \beta_j \in \mathcal{B}_0 \ \forall\, 1 \leq j \leq k \ \text{ and } \ K_t^u \cap I^u(\beta) \neq \emptyset\}$$

Our plan towards the proof of Proposition 2.10 is to extract from $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$ a rich alphabet $\mathcal{B}$ inducing a complete shift $\Sigma(\mathcal{B}) = \mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{Z}} \subset \Sigma_{t-\delta}$ for some $\delta > 0$. In this direction, the following notion plays a key role:

Definition 2.12. Given $\beta = \beta_1 \dots \beta_k \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$ with $\beta_i \in \mathcal{B}_0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$, we say that $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ is a *right-good position* of β if there are two elements

$$\beta^{(n)} = \beta_1 \dots \beta_{j-1} \beta_j^{(n)} \dots \beta_k^{(n)}, \quad n = 1, 2$$

of $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$ such that $\sup I^u(\beta_j^{(1)}) < \inf I^u(\beta_j) \leq \sup I^u(\beta_j) < \inf I^u(\beta_j^{(2)})$, i.e., the interval $I^u(\beta_j)$ is located between $I^u(\beta_j^{(1)})$ and $I^u(\beta_j^{(2)})$.

Similarly, we say that $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ is a *left-good position* of β if there are two elements

$$\beta^{(n)} = \beta_1^{(n)} \dots \beta_j^{(n)} \beta_{j+1} \dots \beta_k, \quad n = 3, 4$$

of $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$ such that $\sup I^s((\beta_j^{(3)})^T) < \inf I^s(\beta_j^T) \leq \sup I^s(\beta_j^T) < \inf I^s((\beta_j^{(4)})^T)$, i.e., the interval $I^s(\beta_j^T)$ is located between $I^s((\beta_j^{(3)})^T)$ and $I^s((\beta_j^{(4)})^T)$.

Finally, we say that $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ is a *good position* of β if it is both a right-good and a left-good position of β.

Our first combinatorial lemma says that most positions of most words of $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$ are good:

Lemma 2.13. *The subset*

$$\mathcal{E} = \{\beta = \beta_1 \dots \beta_k \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}} : \ \textit{the number of good positions of } \beta \textit{ is } \geq 9k/10\}$$

has cardinality

$$\#\mathcal{E} \geq \#\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}/2 > N_0^{(1-\tau)k}$$

Proof. Let us begin by estimating the cardinality of $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$. Recall that the sizes of the intervals $I^u(\alpha)$ behave essentially submultiplicatively due the bounded distortion property of g_u (cf. Remark 2.1) so that, for some constant $c_1 = c_1(\varphi, \Lambda) \geq 1$, one has

$$|I^u(\beta)| \leq \exp(-k(r_0 - c_1))$$

for any $\beta \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$, and, thus, $\{I^u(\beta) : \beta \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}\}$ is a covering of K_t^u by intervals of sizes $\leq \exp(-k(r_0 - c_1))$. In particular, we have a natural surjective map $h : \widetilde{\mathcal{B}} \to \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{u}}(t, k(r_0 - c_1))$ given by

$$h((b_1 \dots b_{n(k)})) = (b_1 \dots b_j)$$

where

$$j := \min\{1 \leq i \leq n(k) : r^{(\mathbf{u})}(b_1 \dots b_i) \geq k(r_0 - c_1)\}$$

On the other hand, since $k(r_0 - c_1) \geq r_0$ for $r_0 = r_0(\varphi, f, t) \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough, by (2.3) we have that

$$\#\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{u}}(t, k(r_0 - c_1)) := N_{\mathbf{u}}(t, k(r_0 - c_1)) \geq \frac{1}{4}\exp(k(r_0 - c_1)D_u(t))$$

In particular, by putting these informations together, we see that, for $r_0 = r_0(\varphi, f, t) \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough, the following estimate holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
\#\widetilde{\mathcal{B}} &\geq \frac{1}{4}\exp(k(r_0 - c_1)D_u(t)) \\
&> 2\exp(k(r_0 - 2c_1)D_u(t)) \quad (\text{since } k \text{ is large for } r_0 \text{ large by (2.3) and } D_u(t) > 0) \\
&\geq 2\exp\left(\left(1 - \frac{\tau}{2}\right) kr_0 D_u(t)\right) > 2\exp\left((1-\tau)\left(1 + \frac{\tau}{2}\right) kr_0 D_u(t)\right) \\
&> 2N_0^{(1-\tau)k} \quad (\text{since } N_0 < \exp((1+\tau/2)r_0 D_u(t)) \text{ by (2.3)})
\end{aligned}$$

In summary, the set $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$ has cardinality

$$\#\widetilde{\mathcal{B}} > 2N_0^{(1-\tau)k} \tag{2.4}$$

for $r_0 = r_0(\varphi, f, t, \eta) \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough.

Now, let us estimate the cardinality of the subset of $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$ consisting of words β such that at least $k/20$ positions are not right-good. First, we notice that there are at most 2^k choices for the set of $m \geq k/20$ right-bad (i.e., not right-good) positions. Secondly, once this set of right-bad positions is fixed:

- if j is a right-bad position and $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{j-1} \in \mathcal{B}_0$ were already chosen, then we see that there are at most two possibilities for $\beta_j \in \mathcal{B}_0$ (namely, the choices leading to the leftmost and rightmost subintervals of $I^u(\beta_1 \ldots \beta_{j-1})$ of the form $I^u(\beta_1 \ldots \beta_k)$ intersecting K_t^u);
- if j is not a right-bad position, then there are at most N_0 choices of β_j.

In particular, once a set of $m \geq k/20$ right-bad positions is fixed, the quantity of words in $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$ with this set of m right-bad positions is at most

$$2^m \cdot N_0^{k-m} \leq 2^{k/20} \cdot N_0^{19k/20}$$

Therefore, the quantity of words in $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$ with at least $k/20$ right-bad positions is

$$\leq 2^k \cdot 2^{k/20} \cdot N_0^{19k/20} = 2^{21k/20} \cdot N_0^{19k/20}$$

Analogously, the quantity of words in $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$ with at least $k/20$ left-bad positions is also $\leq 2^{21k/20} \cdot N_0^{19k/20}$.

By definition of $\mathcal{E}$, it follows that

$$\#\mathcal{E} \geq \#\widetilde{\mathcal{B}} - 2 \cdot 2^{21k/20} \cdot N_0^{19k/20}$$

Since $\#\widetilde{\mathcal{B}} > 2N_0^{(1-\tau)k}$ (by (2.4)) and $2^{1+21k/20} \cdot N_0^{19k/20} < N_0^{(1-\tau)k}$ (from our choices of r_0 large, N_0 and k), we deduce that

$$\#\mathcal{E} \geq \frac{1}{2}\#\widetilde{\mathcal{B}} > N_0^{(1-\tau)k}.$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. □

In the sequel, we will call *excellent word* an arbitrary element $\beta \in \mathcal{E}$ of the subset $\mathcal{E}$ introduced in Lemma 2.13 above.

Our second combinatorial lemma states that several excellent words $\beta \in \mathcal{E}$ share the same good poistions and the same words of $\mathcal{B}_0$ appearing in these positions.

Lemma 2.14. *There are natural numbers* $1 \leq \widehat{j}_1 \leq \cdots \leq \widehat{j}_{3N_0^2} \leq k$ *with* $\widehat{j}_{m+1} - \widehat{j}_m \geq 2\lceil 2/\tau \rceil$ *for* $1 \leq m < 3N_0^2$ *and words* $\widehat{\beta}_{\widehat{j}_1}, \widehat{\beta}_{\widehat{j}_1+1}, \ldots, \widehat{\beta}_{\widehat{j}_{3N_0^2}}, \widehat{\beta}_{\widehat{j}_{3N_0^2}+1} \in \mathcal{B}_0$ *such that the set*

$$X := \{\beta_1 \ldots \beta_k \in \mathcal{E} : \widehat{j}_m, \widehat{j}_m+1 \text{ good positions and } \beta_{\widehat{j}_m} = \widehat{\beta}_{\widehat{j}_m}, \beta_{\widehat{j}_m+1} = \widehat{\beta}_{\widehat{j}_m+1} \, \forall \, 1 \leq m < 3N_0^2\}$$

has cardinality

$$\#X > N_0^{(1-2\tau)k}$$

Proof. Given $\beta = \beta_1 \ldots \beta_k \in \mathcal{E}$ an excellent word, we can find $\lceil 2k/5 \rceil$ positions

$$1 \leq i_1 \leq \cdots \leq i_{\lceil 2k/5 \rceil} \leq k$$

such that $i_{n+1} \geq i_n + 2$ for all $1 \leq n < \lceil 2k/5 \rceil$ and the positions

$$i_1, i_1 + 1, \ldots, i_{\lceil 2k/5 \rceil}, i_{\lceil 2k/5 \rceil} + 1$$

are good.

Since we took $k := 8N_0^2\lceil 2/\tau \rceil$, it makes sense to set

$$j_n := i_{n\lceil 2/\tau \rceil} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq n \leq 3N_0^2$$

because $3N_0^2\lceil 2/\tau \rceil < (16/5)N_0^2\lceil 2/\tau \rceil = 2k/5$. In this way, we obtain positions such that

$$j_{n+1} - j_n \geq 2\lceil 2/\tau \rceil \quad \text{for } 1 \leq n \leq 3N_0^2$$

and $j_1, j_1 + 1, \ldots, j_{3N_0^2}, j_{3N_0^2} + 1$ are good positions.

Now, we observe that:

- the number of possibilities for $(j_1, \ldots, j_{3N_0^2})$ is at most $\binom{k}{3N_0^2} < 2^k$ and
- for each fixed $(j_1, \ldots, j_{3N_0^2})$, the number of possibilities for

$$(\beta_{j_1}, \beta_{j_1+1}, \ldots, \beta_{3N_0^2}, \beta_{3N_0^2} + 1)$$

is at most $N_0^{6N_0^2}$ (because $N_0 = \#\mathcal{B}_0$ and $\beta_{j_n}, \beta_{j_n+1} \in \mathcal{B}_0$ for $1 \leq n \leq 3N_0^2$).

Hence, we can choose $1 < \widehat{j}_1 < \cdots < \widehat{j}_{3N_0^2} < k$ with $\widehat{j}_{n+1} - \widehat{j}_n \geq 2\lceil 2/\tau \rceil$ for $1 \leq n \leq 3N_0^2$, and some words

$$\widehat{\beta}_{\widehat{j}_1}, \widehat{\beta}_{\widehat{j}_1+1}, \ldots, \widehat{\beta}_{\widehat{j}_{3N_0^2}}, \widehat{\beta}_{\widehat{j}_{3N_0^2}+1} \in \mathcal{B}_0$$

such that the set

$$X := \{\beta_1 \ldots \beta_k \in \mathcal{E} : \widehat{j}_m, \widehat{j}_m{+}1 \text{ good positions and } \beta_{\widehat{j}_m} = \widehat{\beta}_{\widehat{j}_m}, \beta_{\widehat{j}_m+1} = \widehat{\beta}_{\widehat{j}_m+1} \, \forall \, 1 \leq m < 3N_0^2\}$$

has cardinality

$$\#X \geq \frac{\#\mathcal{E}}{2^k N_0^{6N_0^2}}$$

Since $\#\mathcal{E} \geq N_0^{(1-\tau)k}$ (cf. Lemma 2.13) and $2^k N_0^{6N_0^2} < N_0^{\tau k}$, the proof of the lemma is complete. □

Our third combinatorial lemma states that it is possible to cut excellent words in the subset X provided by Lemma 2.14 at certain good positions in such a way that one obtains a finite set $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_u$ with non-neglectible cardinality.

Lemma 2.15. *In the context of Lemma 2.14, given $1 \leq p < q \leq 3N_0^2$, let $\pi_{p,q} : X \to \mathcal{B}_0^{\widehat{j}_q - \widehat{j}_p}$ be the projection*

$$\pi_{p,q}(\beta_1 \ldots \beta_k) := (\beta_{\widehat{j}_p+1}, \ldots, \beta_{\widehat{j}_q})$$

obtained by cutting a word $\beta_1 \ldots \beta_k \in X$ at the positions $\widehat{j}_p$ and $\widehat{j}_q$ and discarding the words β_j with $j \leq \widehat{j}_p$ and $j > \widehat{j}_q$.

Then, there are $1 \leq p_0 < q_0 \leq 3N_0^2$ such that $\widehat{\beta}_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}} = \widehat{\beta}_{\widehat{j}_{q_0}}$, $\widehat{\beta}_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+1} = \widehat{\beta}_{\widehat{j}_{q_0}+1}$ and the cardinality of

$$\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_u := \pi_{p_0,q_0}(X)$$

is

$$\#\mathcal{B} > N_0^{(1-10\tau)(\widehat{j}_{q_0} - \widehat{j}_{p_0})}$$

Proof. For each pair of indices (p, q), $1 \leq p < q \leq 3N_0^2$ with $\#\pi_{p,q}(X) \leq N_0^{(1-10\tau)(\widehat{j}_q - \widehat{j}_p)}$, we exclude from $\{1, \ldots, 3N_0^2\}$ the interval $[p, q-1] \cap \mathbb{Z} := \{p, p+1, \ldots, q-1\}$.

We affirm that the cardinality of the set $\mathcal{Z}$ of excluded indices is $< 2N_0^2$. Indeed, suppose by contradiction that $\#\mathcal{Z} \geq 2N_0^2$. By definition, $\mathcal{Z}$ is the union of the finite family of intervals $[p, q-1]$ with $\#\pi_{p,q}(X) \leq N_0^{(1-10\tau)(\widehat{j}_q - \widehat{j}_p)}$. Now, it is not hard to see that, given any finite family of intervals $\mathcal{F}$, there exists a subfamily $\mathcal{F}_0 \subset \mathcal{F}$ of *disjoint* intervals whose sum of lengths

$$\sum_{J \in \mathcal{F}_0} |J|$$

is at least *half* of the measure of

$$\bigcup_{I\in\mathcal{F}} I$$

Applying this fact to the family of intervals defining $\mathcal{Z}$, it follows that we can select a subfamily $\mathcal{P}$ of pairs (p,q) such that $\pi_{p,q}(X) \leq N_0^{(1-10\tau)(\widehat{j}_q-\widehat{j}_p)}$ leading to disjoint intervals $[p,q-1]$ whose sum of lengths

$$\sum_{(p,q)\in\mathcal{P}} (q-p) \geq \frac{1}{2}\#\mathcal{Z}.$$

Since $\widehat{j}_m$, $1\leq m\leq 3N_0^2$, were constructed so that $\widehat{j}_{m+1}-\widehat{j}_m \geq 2\lceil 2/\tau\rceil$ (cf. Lemma 2.14) and we are assuming (by contradiction) that $\#\mathcal{Z}\geq 2N_0^2$, we deduce from the previous estimate that

$$\sum_{(p,q)\in\mathcal{P}} (\widehat{j}_q-\widehat{j}_p) \geq 2\lceil 2/\tau\rceil \sum_{(p,q)\in\mathcal{P}} (q-p) \geq 2\lceil 2/\tau\rceil N_0^2 \tag{2.5}$$

On the other hand, since $\#\pi_{p,q}(X)\leq N_0^{(1-10\tau)(\widehat{j}_q-\widehat{j}_p)}$ for $(p,q)\in\mathcal{P}$, we get that

$$\#X < N_0^{(1-10\tau)\sum\limits_{(p,q)\in\mathcal{P}}(\widehat{j}_q-\widehat{j}_p)} \cdot N_0^{\#\{1\leq i\leq k\,:\, i\notin[\widehat{j}_p,\widehat{j}_q-1]\,\forall\,(p,q)\in\mathcal{P}\}}$$

because there are at most N_0 choices for $\beta_i\in\mathcal{B}_0$ for indices $i\notin \bigcup\limits_{(p,q)\in\mathcal{P}} [\widehat{j}_p,\widehat{j}_q-1]$, $1\leq i\leq k$. By plugging (2.5) into the previous estimate, we would obtain that

$$\#X < N_0^{(1-10\tau)\cdot 2N_0^2\lceil 2/\tau\rceil}\cdot N_0^{k-2N_0^2\lceil 2/\tau\rceil} = N_0^{k-20\tau N_0^2\lceil 2/\tau\rceil}$$

However, by Lemma 2.14, we also have $\#X > N_0^{(1-2\tau)k}$, so that

$$N_0^{(1-2\tau)k} < N_0^{k-20\tau N_0^2\lceil 2/\tau\rceil}, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad 20N_0^2\lceil 2/\tau\rceil < 2k,$$

a contradiction with our choice of $2k = 16N_0^2\lceil 2/\tau\rceil < 20N_0^2\lceil 2/\tau\rceil$.

Once we know that the subset $\mathcal{Z}$ of excluded indices in $\{1,\ldots,3N_0^2\}$ has cardinality $\#\mathcal{Z}<2N_0^2$, we conclude that there are at least N_0^2+1 non-excluded indices. Since for each $1\leq m\leq 3N_0^2$ there are at most N_0 possibilities for $\widehat{\beta}_{\widehat{j}_m}$, we deduce that there are two non-excluded indices $1\leq p_0<q_0\leq 3N_0^2$ such that $\widehat{\beta}_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}} = \widehat{\beta}_{\widehat{j}_{q_0}}$ and $\widehat{\beta}_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+1} = \widehat{\beta}_{\widehat{j}_{q_0}+1}$. By definition of non-excluded index, $\mathcal{B}=\mathcal{B}_u := \pi_{p_0,q_0}(X)$ satisfies the conclusions of the Lemma. □

At this point, we are ready to complete the proof of Proposition 2.10 by showing that the finite set $\mathcal{B}=\mathcal{B}_u=\pi_{p_0,q_0}(X)$ has the desired properties.

Proof of Proposition 2.10. Recall from Remark 2.11 that our task is reduced to show that the complete shift $\Sigma(\mathcal{B})$ associated to $\mathcal{B}=\mathcal{B}_u$ generates a Cantor set $K^u(\mathcal{B})$ with Hausdorff dimension

$$\dim(K^u(\Sigma(\mathcal{B}))) > (1-\eta)D_u(t)$$

and $\Sigma(\mathcal{B}) \subset \Sigma_{t-\delta}$ for some $\delta > 0$.

We start by estimating the Hausdorff dimension of the Cantor set $K^u(\Sigma(\mathcal{B}_u))$ induced by $\mathcal{B}_u = \mathcal{B}$.

Note that $K^u(\Sigma(\mathcal{B}_u))$ is a $C^{1+\varepsilon}$-dynamically defined Cantor set associated to certain iterates of g_u defined on the intervals $I^u(\alpha)$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{B}$. In this situation, it is known from the usual bounded distortion property (cf. Remark 2.1) that the Hausdorff dimension and box counting dimensions of $K^u(\Sigma(\mathcal{B}))$ coincide and they satisfy

$$\dim(K^u(\Sigma(\mathcal{B}))) \geq \frac{\log \#\mathcal{B}}{-\log(\min_{\alpha\in\mathcal{B}} |I^u(\alpha)|)}$$

Since $\#\mathcal{B} > N_0^{(1-10\tau)(\widehat{j}_{q_0} - \widehat{j}_{p_0})}$ (cf. Lemma 2.15) and, for some constant $c_1 = c_1(\varphi, \Lambda) > 0$, one has $|I^u(\alpha)| \geq e^{-(\widehat{j}_{q_0} - \widehat{j}_{p_0})(r_0 + c_1)}$ (by the usual bounded distortion property cf. Remark 2.1) for each $\alpha \in \mathcal{B}$, we deduce from the previous estimate that

$$\dim(K^u(\Sigma(\mathcal{B}))) > \frac{(1-10\tau)\log N_0}{r_0 + c_1}.$$

Now, recall that $N_0 = N_{\mathbf{u}}(t, r_0)$ satisfy (2.3) so that $\log N_0 > (1-\tau/2) r_0 D_u(t)$. Hence, by plugging this into the previous inequality (and by recalling that $\tau = \eta/100$), we obtain

$$\dim(K^u(\Sigma(\mathcal{B}))) > \frac{(1-10\tau)(1-\frac{\tau}{2})r_0}{r_0 + c_1} D_u(t) > (1-12\tau)D_u(t) > (1-\eta)D_u(t)$$

for $r_0 = r_0(\eta) \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large.

Similarly, we also have that

$$\dim(K^s(\Sigma(\mathcal{B}^T))) \geq \frac{\log \#\mathcal{B}}{-\log(\min_{\alpha\in\mathcal{B}} |I^s(\alpha^T)|)}$$

Because $|I^s(\alpha^T)|$ is comparable to $|I^u(\alpha)|$ up to the multiplicative factor e^{c_2} (cf. Remark 2.2), we deduce from the computations of the previous paragraph that

$$\dim(K^s(\Sigma(\mathcal{B}^T))) > \frac{(1-10\tau)(1-\frac{\tau}{2})r_0}{(r_0 + c_1 + c_2)} D_u(t) > (1-\eta)D_u(t)$$

for $r_0 = r_0(\eta) \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large.

At this point, it remains only to prove that $\Sigma(\mathcal{B}) \subset \Sigma_{t-\delta}$ for some $\delta > 0$. For this sake, we denote by

$$\gamma_1 := \widehat{\beta}_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+1} = \widehat{\beta}_{\widehat{j}_{q_0}+1}, \quad \gamma_2 := \widehat{\beta}_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}} = \widehat{\beta}_{\widehat{j}_{q_0}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{n} := \widehat{j}_{q_0} - \widehat{j}_{p_0}$$

so that, by definition, the elements $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$ have the form

$$\beta = \gamma_1 \beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+2} \dots \beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+\widehat{n}-1} \gamma_2$$

with $\gamma_1, \beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+2}, \dots, \beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+\widehat{n}-1}, \gamma_2 \in \mathcal{B}_0$, $\widehat{n} := \widehat{j}_{q_0} - \widehat{j}_{p_0}$, and

$$\sup I^s((\gamma_1')^T) < \inf I^s(\gamma_1^T) \leq \sup I^s(\gamma_1^T) < \inf I^s((\gamma_1'')^T),$$

$$\sup I^u(\gamma_2') < \inf I^u(\gamma_2) \leq \sup I^u(\gamma_2) < \inf I^u(\gamma_2''),$$

for some words $\gamma_1', \gamma_1'', \gamma_2', \gamma_2'' \in \mathcal{B}_0$ verifying

$$I^u(\gamma_1'\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+2} \dots \beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+\widehat{n}-1}\gamma_2\gamma_1) \cap K_t^u \neq \emptyset, \quad I^u(\gamma_1''\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+2} \dots \beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+\widehat{n}-1}\gamma_2\gamma_1) \cap K_t^u \neq \emptyset,$$

$$I^u(\gamma_2\gamma_1\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+2} \dots \beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+\widehat{n}-1}\gamma_2') \cap K_t^u \neq \emptyset, \quad I^u(\gamma_2\gamma_1\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+2} \dots \beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+\widehat{n}-1}\gamma_2'') \cap K_t^u \neq \emptyset$$

In particular, an element of $\Sigma(\mathcal{B})$ has the form

$$\underline{\theta}^{(1)}\gamma_2; \gamma_1\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+2} \dots \beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+\widehat{n}-1}\gamma_2\gamma_1\underline{\theta}^{(2)}$$

where $\gamma_1\underline{\theta}^{(2)} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $\underline{\theta}^{(1)}\gamma_2 \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}^-}$ are infinite concatenations of elements of $\mathcal{B}$ and the symbol ; serves to mark the location of the entry of index 1 of the bi-infinite sequence $\underline{\theta}^{(1)}\gamma_2; \gamma_1\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+2} \dots \beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+\widehat{n}-1}\gamma_2\gamma_1\underline{\theta}^{(2)}$.

In this notation, our task of showing that $\Sigma(\mathcal{B}) \subset \Sigma_{t-\delta}$ for some $\delta > 0$ is equivalent to show that

$$f(\sigma^\ell(\underline{\theta}^{(1)}\gamma_2; \gamma_1\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+2} \dots \beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+\widehat{n}-1}\gamma_2\gamma_1\underline{\theta}^{(2)})) \leq t - \delta \tag{2.6}$$

for all $0 \leq \ell \leq \widehat{m}_1 + \widehat{m} + \widehat{m_2} - 1$ where $\gamma_1 := a_1 \dots a_{\widehat{m}_1}$, $\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+2} \dots \beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+\widehat{n}-1} := b_1 \dots b_{\widehat{m}}$ and $\gamma_2 := d_1 \dots d_{\widehat{m}_2}$.

We consider two regimes for $1 \leq \ell \leq \widehat{m}_1 + \widehat{m} + \widehat{m_2} - 1$:

I) $\widehat{m}_1 \leq \ell \leq \widehat{m}_1 + \widehat{m} - 1$
II) $0 \leq \ell \leq \widehat{m}_1 - 1$ or $\widehat{m}_1 + \widehat{m} \leq \ell \leq \widehat{m}_1 + \widehat{m} + \widehat{m}_2 - 1$.

In case I), we write $\ell = \widehat{m}_1 - 1 + j$ so that

$$\sigma^\ell(\underline{\theta}^{(1)}\gamma_2; \gamma_1\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+2} \dots \beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+\widehat{n}-1}\gamma_2\gamma_1\underline{\theta}^{(2)}) = \underline{\theta}^{(1)}\gamma_2\gamma_1 b_1 \dots b_{j-1}; b_j \dots b_{\widehat{m}}\gamma_2\gamma_1\underline{\theta}^{(2)} \tag{2.7}$$

We have two possibilities:

I.a) $|I^s((\gamma_1 b_1 \dots b_{j-1})^T)| \leq |I^u(b_j \dots b_{\widehat{m}}\gamma_2)|$
I.b) $|I^u(b_j \dots b_{\widehat{m}}\gamma_2)| \leq |I^s((\gamma_1 b_1 \dots b_{j-1})^T)|$

In case I.a), we choose $\gamma_2^* \in \{\gamma_2', \gamma_2''\}$ such that

$$f(\underline{\theta}^{(1)}\gamma_2\gamma_1 b_1 \dots b_{j-1}; b_j \dots b_{\widehat{m}}\gamma_2\gamma_1\underline{\theta}^{(2)}) < f(\underline{\theta}^{(1)}\gamma_2\gamma_1 b_1 \dots b_{j-1}; b_j \dots b_{\widehat{m}}\gamma_2^*\underline{\theta}^{(4)})$$

for any $\underline{\theta}^{(4)} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$ (because of the local monotonicity of f along stable and unstable manifolds). By (2.1), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &f(\underline{\theta}^{(1)}\gamma_2\gamma_1 b_1 \dots b_{j-1}; b_j \dots b_{\widehat{m}}\gamma_2\gamma_1\underline{\theta}^{(2)}) + c_6|I^u(b_j \dots b_{\widehat{m}}\gamma_2)| \\ &< f(\underline{\theta}^{(1)}\gamma_2\gamma_1 b_1 \dots b_{j-1}; b_j \dots b_{\widehat{m}}\gamma_2^*\underline{\theta}^{(4)}) \end{aligned}$$

for some $c_6 = c_6(\varphi, f) > 0$. On the other hand, by (2.2), we also know that, for some $c_7 = c_7(\varphi, f) > 0$, the function f obeys the Lipschitz estimate

$$\begin{aligned}&|f(\underline{\theta}^{(3)}\gamma_2\gamma_1 b_1 \dots b_{j-1}; b_j \dots b_{\widehat{m}}\gamma_2^*\underline{\theta}^{(4)}) - f(\underline{\theta}^{(1)}\gamma_2\gamma_1 b_1 \dots b_{j-1}; b_j \dots b_{\widehat{m}}\gamma_2^*\underline{\theta}^{(4)})|\\ &< c_7|I^s((\gamma_2\gamma_1 b_1 \dots b_{j-1})^T)|\end{aligned}$$

for any $\underline{\theta}^{(3)} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}^-}$. From these estimates, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}&f(\underline{\theta}^{(1)}\gamma_2\gamma_1 b_1 \dots b_{j-1}; b_j \dots b_{\widehat{m}}\gamma_2\gamma_1\underline{\theta}^{(2)}) + c_6|I^u(b_j \dots b_{\widehat{m}}\gamma_2)| <\\ &f(\underline{\theta}^{(3)}\gamma_2\gamma_1 b_1 \dots b_{j-1}; b_j \dots b_{\widehat{m}}\gamma_2^*\underline{\theta}^{(4)}) + c_7|I^s((\gamma_2\gamma_1 b_1 \dots b_{j-1})^T)|\end{aligned}$$

for any $\underline{\theta}^{(3)} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}^-}$ and $\underline{\theta}^{(4)} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$. Now, we observe that the usual bounded distortion property (cf. Remark 2.1) implies that

$$|I^s((\gamma_2\gamma_1 b_1 \dots b_{j-1})^T)| \le e^{c_1}|I^s(\gamma_2^T)| \cdot |I^s((\gamma_1 b_1 \dots b_{j-1})^T)|$$

for some $c_1 = c_1(\varphi) > 0$. By plugging this information into the previous estimate, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&f(\underline{\theta}^{(1)}\gamma_2\gamma_1 b_1 \dots b_{j-1}; b_j \dots b_{\widehat{m}}\gamma_2\gamma_1\underline{\theta}^{(2)}) + c_6|I^u(b_j \dots b_{\widehat{m}}\gamma_2)| <\\ &f(\underline{\theta}^{(3)}\gamma_2\gamma_1 b_1 \dots b_{j-1}; b_j \dots b_{\widehat{m}}\gamma_2^*\underline{\theta}^{(4)}) + c_7 e^{c_1}|I^s(\gamma_2^T)| \cdot |I^s((\gamma_1 b_1 \dots b_{j-1})^T)|\end{aligned}$$

Since we are dealing with case I.a), i.e., $|I^s((\gamma_1 b_1 \dots b_{j-1})^T)| \le |I^u(b_j \dots b_{\widehat{m}}\gamma_2)|$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}&f(\underline{\theta}^{(1)}\gamma_2\gamma_1 b_1 \dots b_{j-1}; b_j \dots b_{\widehat{m}}\gamma_2\gamma_1\underline{\theta}^{(2)}) <\\ &f(\underline{\theta}^{(3)}\gamma_2\gamma_1 b_1 \dots a_{j-1}; b_j \dots b_{\widehat{m}}\gamma_2^*\underline{\theta}^{(4)}) - (c_6 - c_7 e^{c_1}|I^s(\gamma_2^T)|) \cdot |I^u(b_j \dots b_{\widehat{m}}\gamma_2)|\end{aligned}$$

Next, we note that $c_7 e^{c_1}|I^s(\gamma_2^T)| < c_6/2$ if $r_0 = r_0(\varphi, f) \in \mathbb{N}$ is sufficiently large: indeed, since $\gamma_2 \in \mathcal{B}_0 = \mathcal{C}_u(t, r_0)$, we know that $|I^u(\gamma_2)| \le e^{-r_0}$; on the other hand, the usual bounded distortion property ensures that $|I^s(\gamma_2^T)| \le |I^u(\gamma_2)|^{c_8}$ for some constant $c_8 = c_8(\varphi) > 0$, so that $c_7 e^{c_1}|I^s(\gamma_2^T)| < c_6/2$ for $r_0 > (1/c_8)\log(2c_7 e^{c_1}/c_6)$. In particular, for $r_0 = r_0(\varphi, f, t, \eta) \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}&f(\underline{\theta}^{(1)}\gamma_2\gamma_1 b_1 \dots b_{j-1}; b_j \dots b_{\widehat{m}}\gamma_2\gamma_1\underline{\theta}^{(2)}) <\\ &f(\underline{\theta}^{(3)}\gamma_2\gamma_1 b_1 \dots b_{j-1}; b_j \dots b_{\widehat{m}}\gamma_2^*\underline{\theta}^{(4)}) - (c_6/2) \cdot |I^u(b_j \dots b_{\widehat{m}}\gamma_2)|\end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

for any $\underline{\theta}^{(3)} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}^-}$ and $\underline{\theta}^{(4)} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$. Now, we recall that $\gamma_2^* \in \{\gamma_2', \gamma_2''\}$, so that

$$I^u(\gamma_2\gamma_1\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+2} \dots \beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+\widehat{n}-1}\gamma_2^*) \cap K_t^u \neq \emptyset.$$

By definition, this means that there are $\underline{\theta}_*^{(3)} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}^-}$ and $\underline{\theta}_*^{(4)} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$ with

$$\underline{\theta}_*^{(3)}; \gamma_2\gamma_1\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+2} \dots \beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+\widehat{n}-1}\gamma_2^*\underline{\theta}_*^{(4)} \in \Sigma_t,$$

and, *a fortiori*,

$$f(\sigma^{\widehat{m}_2+\ell}(\underline{\theta}_*^{(3)}; \gamma_2\gamma_1 b_1 \dots b_{\widehat{m}}\gamma_2^*\underline{\theta}_*^{(4)})) = f(\underline{\theta}_*^{(3)}\gamma_2\gamma_1 b_1 \dots b_{j-1}; b_j \dots b_{\widehat{m}}\gamma_2^*\underline{\theta}_*^{(4)}) \le t.$$

Here, we used (2.7) for the first equality. Combining this with (2.8), we see that

$$f(\underline{\theta}^{(1)}\gamma_2\gamma_1 b_1 \dots b_{j-1}; b_j \dots b_{\widehat{m}}\gamma_2\gamma_1\underline{\theta}^{(2)}) < t - (c_6/2) \cdot |I^u(b_j \dots b_{\widehat{m}}\gamma_2)|.$$

Therefore, in case I.a), we conclude that

$$f(\sigma^{\ell}(\underline{\theta}^{(1)}\gamma_2;\gamma_1\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+2}\dots\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+\widehat{n}-1}\gamma_2\gamma_1\underline{\theta}^{(2)}))<t-\delta_1 \tag{2.9}$$

where

$$\delta_1:=\frac{c_6}{2}\min_{\gamma_1 b_1\dots b_{\widehat{m}}\in\mathcal{B}}\ \min_{1\le j\le\widehat{m}-1}\ |I^u(b_j\dots b_{\widehat{m}}\gamma_2)|>0$$

The case I.b) is dealt with in a symmetric manner: in fact, by mimicking the argument above for case I.a), one gets that in case I.b)

$$f(\sigma^{\ell}(\underline{\theta}^{(1)}\gamma_2;\gamma_1\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+2}\dots\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+\widehat{n}-1}\gamma_2\gamma_1\underline{\theta}^{(2)}))<t-\delta_2 \tag{2.10}$$

where

$$\delta_2:=\frac{c_6}{2}\min_{\gamma_1 b_1\dots b_{\widehat{m}}\in\mathcal{B}}\ \min_{1\le j\le\widehat{m}-1}\ |I^s((\gamma_1 b_1\dots b_{j-1})^T)|>0$$

Finally, the case II) is dealt with in a similar way to case I.a). We write

$$\begin{aligned}&\sigma^{\ell}(\underline{\theta}^{(1)}\gamma_2;\gamma_1\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+2}\dots\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+\widehat{n}-1}\gamma_2\gamma_1\underline{\theta}^{(2)})=\\&\underline{\theta}^{(1)}\gamma_2 a_1\dots a_{\ell};a_{\ell+1}\dots a_{\widehat{m}}\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+2}\dots\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+\widehat{n}-1}\gamma_2\gamma_1\underline{\theta}^{(2)}\end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

for $0\le\ell\le\widehat{m}_1-1$, and

$$\begin{aligned}&\sigma^{\ell}(\underline{\theta}^{(1)}\gamma_2;\gamma_1\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+2}\dots\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+\widehat{n}-1}\gamma_2\gamma_1\underline{\theta}^{(2)})=\\&\underline{\theta}^{(1)}\gamma_2\gamma_1\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+2}\dots\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+\widehat{n}-1}d_1\dots d_{\ell-\widehat{m}_1-\widehat{m}};d_{\ell-\widehat{m}_1-\widehat{m}+1}\dots d_{\widehat{m}_2}\gamma_1\underline{\theta}^{(2)}\end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

for $\widehat{m}_1+\widehat{m}\le\ell\le\widehat{m}_1+\widehat{m}+\widehat{m}_2-1$.

Since $\widehat{j}_{q_0}-\widehat{j}_{p_0}\ge 2\lceil 2/\tau\rceil(q_0-p_0)\ge 2\lceil 2/\tau\rceil$ and $\gamma_1,\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+1},\dots,\beta_{\widehat{j}_{q_0}-1},\gamma_2\in\mathcal{B}_0=\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{u}}(t,r_0)$, we see from the usual bounded distortion property (cf. Remark 2.1) that, if r_0 is sufficiently large, then

$$|I^u(a_{\ell+1}\dots a_{\widehat{m}}\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+2}\dots\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+\widehat{n}-1}\gamma_2)|\le|I^s((\gamma_2 a_1\dots a_{\ell})^T)|$$

for $0\le\ell\le\widehat{m}_1-1$, and

$$|I^s((\gamma_1\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+2}\dots\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+\widehat{n}-1}d_1\dots d_{\ell-\widehat{m}_1-\widehat{m}})^T)|\le|I^u(d_{\ell-\widehat{m}_1-\widehat{m}+1}\dots d_{\widehat{m}_2}\gamma_1)|$$

for $\widehat{m}_1+\widehat{m}\le\ell\le\widehat{m}_1+\widehat{m}+\widehat{m}_2-1$. By plugging this into the argument for case I.a), one deduces that

$$f(\sigma^{\ell}(\underline{\theta}^{(1)}\gamma_2;\gamma_1\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+2}\dots\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+\widehat{n}-1}\gamma_2\gamma_1\underline{\theta}^{(2)}))<t-\delta_3 \tag{2.13}$$

for $0\le\ell\le\widehat{m}_1-1$, and

$$f(\sigma^{\ell}(\underline{\theta}^{(1)}\gamma_2;\gamma_1\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+2}\dots\beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+\widehat{n}-1}\gamma_2\gamma_1\underline{\theta}^{(2)}))<t-\delta_4 \tag{2.14}$$

for $\widehat{m}_1+\widehat{m}\le\ell\le\widehat{m}_1+\widehat{m}+\widehat{m}_2-1$, where

$$\delta_3:=\frac{c_6}{2}\min_{\gamma_1 b_1\dots b_{\widehat{m}}\in\mathcal{B}}\ \min_{1\le\ell\le\widehat{m}_1-1}\ |I^s((\gamma_2 a_1\dots a_{\ell})^T)|>0$$

and

$$\delta_4 := \frac{c_6}{2} \min_{\gamma_1 b_1 \dots b_{\widehat{m}} \in \mathcal{B}} \min_{1 \le \ell \le \widehat{m}_1 - 1} |I^u(d_{\ell - \widehat{m_1} - \widehat{m}+1} \dots d_{\widehat{m}_2} \gamma_1)| > 0$$

In summary, from (2.9), (2.10), (2.13), and (2.14), by setting

$$\delta := \min\{\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3, \delta_4\} > 0,$$

we deduce that (2.6) holds, i.e.,

$$f(\sigma^\ell(\underline{\theta}^{(1)}\gamma_2; \gamma_1 \beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+2} \dots \beta_{\widehat{j}_{p_0}+\widehat{n}-1} \gamma_2 \gamma_1 \underline{\theta}^{(2)})) < t - \delta$$

for $0 \le \ell \le \widehat{m}_1 + \widehat{m} + \widehat{m}_2 - 1$. In other terms, we showed that $\Sigma(\mathcal{B}) \subset \Sigma_{t-\delta}$. This completes the proof of Proposition 2.10. □

2.5. **Approximation of Lagrange spectrum by images of "subhorseshoes".**

Proposition 2.16. *Let $f \in \mathcal{R}_{\varphi,\Lambda}$, $\Sigma(\mathcal{B}) \subset \Sigma \subset \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ be a complete subshift associated to a finite alphabet $\mathcal{B}$ of finite words on $\mathcal{A}$, and $\Lambda(\Sigma(\mathcal{B})) \subset \Lambda$ the subhorseshoe of Λ associated to $\mathcal{B}$.*

Then, for each $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a subhorseshoe $\Lambda(\mathcal{B}, \varepsilon) \subset \Lambda(\Sigma(\mathcal{B}))$, a rectangle $R(\mathcal{B}, \varepsilon)$ of some Markov partition of $\Lambda(\mathcal{B}, \varepsilon)$, a C^1-diffeomorphism A defined in a neighborhood of $R(\mathcal{B}, \varepsilon)$ respecting the local stable and unstable foliations, and an integer $j(\mathcal{B}, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $dim(\Lambda(\mathcal{B}, \varepsilon)) \ge (1 - \varepsilon) dim(\Lambda(\Sigma(\mathcal{B})))$ and

$$f(\varphi^{j(\mathcal{B},\varepsilon)}(A(\Lambda(\mathcal{B}, \varepsilon) \cap R(\mathcal{B}, \varepsilon)))) \subset \ell_{\varphi,f}(\Lambda(\Sigma(\mathcal{B})))$$

Proof. Note that $f \in \mathcal{R}_{\varphi,\Lambda}$ attains its maximal value on $\Lambda(\Sigma(\mathcal{B}))$ at finitely many points $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \Lambda(\Sigma(\mathcal{B}))$: this happens because $f \in \mathcal{R}_{\varphi,\Lambda}$ implies that f is locally monotone on stable and unstable manifolds.

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, denote by $\mathcal{B}^n := \{(\beta_{-n}, \dots, \beta_{-1}; \beta_0, \dots, \beta_n) : \beta_i \in \mathcal{B}, i = 1, \dots n\}$.

Given $\varepsilon > 0$, we consider the symbolic sequences $(\beta_n^{(j)})_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ associated to x_j, $j = 1, \dots, k$ and we take[4] $m = m(\varepsilon, k) \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough such that $m > k^2$ and the subhorseshoe $\Lambda_1(\mathcal{B}, \varepsilon) := \Lambda(\Sigma(\mathcal{B}^*))$ of $\Lambda(\Sigma(\mathcal{B}))$ associated to the complete subshift generated by the alphabet

$$\mathcal{B}^* := \mathcal{B}^m - \{\gamma^{(j,m)} := (\beta_{-m}^{(j)}, \dots, \beta_{-1}^{(j)}; \beta_0^{(j)}, \beta_1^{(j)}, \dots, \beta_m^{(j)}) : j = 1, \dots, k\}$$

has Hausdorff dimension

$$\dim(\Lambda_1(\mathcal{B}, \varepsilon)) \ge \dim(\Lambda(\Sigma(\mathcal{B}))) - \varepsilon$$

Denote by R_a the rectangles of the Markov partition of $\Lambda(\Sigma(\mathcal{B}^m))(= \Lambda(\Sigma(\mathcal{B})))$ induced by $\mathcal{B}^m$. By construction, we can find an open set $U \subset M$ such that $\overline{U}$ is disjoint from the Markov rectangles R_j associated to $\gamma_m^{(j)} \in \mathcal{B}^m$, $j = 1, \dots, k$, $U \cap \Lambda(\Sigma(\mathcal{B})) = \Lambda(\Sigma(\mathcal{B})) - \bigcup_{j=1}^{k} R_j$, and $\Lambda_1(\mathcal{B}, \varepsilon) = \bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \varphi^n(U)$. In particular, there exists $\eta > 0$ such that $\max f(\overline{U}) < \min f(\cup_{j=1}^k R_j) - \eta$. Hence, if we take an appropriate periodic point

[4]Compare with Lemma 6 in [MoRo].

in $\Lambda_1(\mathcal{B},\varepsilon)$ with a symbolic sequence $\overline{d} = (\dots, d_{\widehat{m}}, d_{-\widehat{m}}, \dots, d_{-1}; d_0, \dots, d_{\widehat{m}}, d_{-\widehat{m}}, \dots)$, then the sequences of the form

$$\underline{\theta} = (\dots, \beta_{-m-2}, \beta_{-m-1}, d_{-\widehat{m}}, \dots, d_{\widehat{m}}, \gamma^{(1,m)}, d_{-\widehat{m}}, \dots, d_{\widehat{m}}, \beta_{m+1}, \beta_{m+2}, \dots)$$

with $\beta_j \in \mathcal{B}^*$, $|j| > m$, have the property that $m_{\varphi,f}(\underline{\theta}) = \sup_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f(\sigma^n(\underline{\theta}))$ is attained for values of $|n| \leq n_0$ corresponding to the piece $\gamma^{(1,m)}$ and, moreover, $f(\sigma^n(\underline{\theta})) < m_{\varphi,f}(\underline{\theta}) - \eta$ whenever $|n| > n_0$ does not correspond to $\gamma^{(1,m)}$. Furthermore, $m_{\varphi,f}(\underline{\theta}') < m_{\varphi,f}(\underline{\theta}) - \eta$ for all $\underline{\theta}' \in \Sigma(\mathcal{B}^*)$ and $\underline{\theta}$ as above.

Next, we denote by $R(\mathcal{B},\varepsilon) := R_{\overline{d}}$ the Markov rectangle associated to the periodic orbit $\overline{d}$ and we define two maps θ^* and $\underline{\theta}$ from $\Lambda(\mathcal{B},\varepsilon) \cap R(\mathcal{B},\varepsilon)$ to Λ in the following way. Given $x \in \Lambda(\mathcal{B},\varepsilon) \cap R(\mathcal{B},\varepsilon)$, let us denote by the corresponding sequence in $\Sigma(\mathcal{B})$ by $(\dots, \gamma_{-1}, d_{-\widehat{m}}, \dots; d_0, \dots, d_{\widehat{m}}, \gamma_1, \dots)$ where $\gamma_j \in \mathcal{B}^*$ for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. We set

$$\tau^{(j)} := (\gamma_{-|j|}, \dots, \gamma_{-1}, d_{-\widehat{m}}, \dots, d_{\widehat{m}}, \gamma^{(1,m)}, d_{-\widehat{m}}, \dots, d_{\widehat{m}}, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{|j|})$$

for each $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, and we introduce the point $\theta^*(x)$, resp. $\underline{\theta}(x)$, of $\Lambda(\Sigma(\mathcal{B}))$ associated to the sequence

$$(\dots, \tau^{(-2)}, \tau^{(-1)}; \tau^{(1)}, \tau^{(2)}, \dots),$$

resp.

$$(\dots, \gamma_{-2}, \gamma_{-1}, d_{-\widehat{m}}, \dots, d_{\widehat{m}}, \gamma^{(1,m)}, d_{-\widehat{m}}, \dots, d_{\widehat{m}}, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots)$$

Observe that[5] the map $\underline{\theta} : \Lambda(\mathcal{B},\varepsilon) \cap R(\mathcal{B},\varepsilon) \to \Lambda(\Sigma(B))$ extends to a C^1 diffeomorphism A on a neighborhood of $R(\mathcal{B},\varepsilon)$ respecting the stable and unstable foliations.

Given $x \in \Lambda(\mathcal{B},\varepsilon) \cap R(\mathcal{B},\varepsilon)$, we affirm that

$$\ell_{\varphi,f}(\theta^*(x)) = f(\sigma^n(\underline{\theta}(x)))$$

for some $|n| \leq n_0$.

Indeed, we note that $\underline{\theta}(x)$ was constructed in such a way that $m_{\varphi,f}(\underline{\theta}(x)) = f(\sigma^n(\underline{\theta}(x)))$ for some $|n| \leq n_0$. Thus, we have a sequence $(n_k)_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ with n_k corresponding to a position in the piece $\tau^{(k)}$ of $\theta^*(x)$ so that $\sigma^{n_k}(\theta^*(x))$ converges to $\sigma^n(\underline{\theta}(x))$ and, *a fortiori*,

$$\ell_{\varphi,f}(\theta^*(x)) \geq m_{\varphi,f}(\underline{\theta}(x)) = f(\sigma^n(\underline{\theta}(x))). \tag{2.15}$$

Also, if $(m_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(r_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ are sequences where m_k are positions in pieces $\tau^{(r_k)}$ of $\theta^*(x)$ with the property that

$$\ell_{\varphi,f}(\theta^*(x)) = \lim_{k\to\infty} f(\sigma^{m_k}(\theta^*(x))),$$

then one of the following two possibilities occur: the sequence $|m_k - n_{r_k}|$ has a bounded subsequence or the sequence $|m_k - n_{r_k}|$ is unbounded. In the former case, we can find $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\sigma^{m_k}(\theta^*(x))$ has a subsequence converging to $\sigma^b(\underline{\theta}(x))$ and, hence,

$$\ell_{\varphi,f}(\theta^*(x)) = \lim_{k\to\infty} f(\sigma^{m_k}(\theta^*(x))) = f(\sigma^b(\underline{\theta}(x))) \leq m_{\varphi,f}(\underline{\theta}(x)) = f(\sigma^n(\underline{\theta}(x)))$$

[5]Compare with Lemma 5 in [MoRo].

In the latter case, there exists a subsequence of $\sigma^{m_k}(\theta^*(x))$ converging to an element $\theta' \in \Sigma(\mathcal{B}^*)$, but this is a contradiction with (2.15) because

$$\ell_{\varphi,f}(\theta^*(x)) = \lim_{k\to\infty} f(\sigma^{m_k}(\theta^*(x))) = f(\theta') \leq m_{\varphi,f}(\theta') < m_{\varphi,f}(\underline{\theta}(x)) - \eta$$

This proves our claim.

It follows from our claim that

$$\Lambda_1(\mathcal{B},\varepsilon) \cap R(\mathcal{B},\varepsilon) = \bigcup_{j=-n_0}^{n_0} \Lambda(\mathcal{B},\varepsilon,n)$$

where $\Lambda(\mathcal{B},\varepsilon,n) = \{x \in \Lambda_1(\mathcal{B},\varepsilon) \cap R(\mathcal{B},\varepsilon) : \ell_{\varphi,f}(\theta^*(x)) = f(\sigma^n(\underline{\theta}(x)))\}$. Therefore, one of the closed subsets $\Lambda(\mathcal{B},\varepsilon,j(\mathcal{B},\varepsilon))$ has non-empty interior in $\Lambda_1(\mathcal{B},\varepsilon)$ (for some $|j(\mathcal{B},\varepsilon)| \leq n_0$) and, *a fortiori*, we can choose a subhorseshoe $\Lambda(\mathcal{B},\varepsilon)$ and a rectangle of $R(\mathcal{B},\varepsilon)$ of some Markov partition of $\Lambda(\mathcal{B},\varepsilon)$ such that

$$\Lambda(\mathcal{B},\varepsilon) \cap R(\mathcal{B},\varepsilon) \subset \Lambda(\mathcal{B},\varepsilon,j(\mathcal{B},\varepsilon))$$

This completes the proof of the proposition. □

2.6. **Lower semicontinuity of $D_u(t)$ and $D_s(t)$.** Besides Proposition 2.10 and 2.16, our proof of the lower semicontinuity of $D_u(t)$ uses the dimension formula in [Mo2]:

Theorem 2.17. *There exists a Baire residual subset $\mathcal{U}^{**} \subset \mathcal{U}$ such that for any $g \in \mathcal{R}_{\varphi,\Lambda}$ and for every subhorseshoe $\widetilde{\Lambda} \subset \Lambda$ one has*

$$dim(g(\widetilde{\Lambda})) = dim(\widetilde{\Lambda})$$

At this point, we are ready to conclude the lower semicontinuity of the Hausdorff dimension across generic Lagrange and Markov dynamical spectra:

Proposition 2.18. *There exists a Baire residual subset $\mathcal{U}^{**} \subset \mathcal{U}$ such that, for any $f \in \mathcal{R}_{\varphi,\Lambda}$, the functions $t \mapsto D_u(t)$ and $t \mapsto D_s(t)$ are lower semicontinuous and*

$$D_s(t) + D_u(t) = 2D_u(t) = dim(L_{\varphi,f} \cap (-\infty,t)) = dim(M_{\varphi,f} \cap (-\infty,t))$$

Proof. Let $t \in \mathbb{R}$ with $D_u(t) > 0$ and $\eta > 0$. By Proposition 2.10, we can find $\delta > 0$ and a complete subshift $\Sigma(\mathcal{B}) \subset \Sigma_{t-\delta}$ on a finite alphabet $\mathcal{B}$ on finite words of $\mathcal{A}$ such that

$$(1-\eta)(D_s(t) + D_u(t)) = 2(1-\eta)D_u(t) \leq \dim(\Lambda(\Sigma(\mathcal{B})))$$

By Proposition 2.16 and Theorem 2.17, we see that

$$\dim(\Lambda(\Sigma(\mathcal{B}))) \leq \dim(\ell_{\varphi,f}(\Lambda(\Sigma(\mathcal{B}))))$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 2(1-\eta)D_u(t) &\leq \dim(\Lambda(\Sigma(\mathcal{B}))) \leq \dim(\ell_{\varphi,f}(\Lambda(\Sigma(\mathcal{B})))) \\ &\leq \dim(L_{\varphi,f} \cap (-\infty, t-\delta)) \leq \dim(M_{\varphi,f} \cap (-\infty, t-\delta)) \\ &\leq \dim(f(\Lambda_{t-\delta})) \leq \dim(\Lambda_{t-\delta}) \leq 2D_u(t-\delta) \end{aligned}$$

Since $\eta > 0$ is arbitrary, this proves the proposition. □

2.7. **End of the proof of Theorem 1.2.** Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{U}^{**}$ and $f \in \mathcal{R}_{\varphi,\Lambda}$: note that $\mathcal{U}^{**}$ is residual by Theorem 2.17 and $\mathcal{R}_{\varphi,\Lambda}$ is C^r-open and dense by Proposition 2.7.

By Propositions 2.6 and 2.18, the function

$$t \mapsto D_s(t) = D_u(t) = \frac{1}{2}\dim(L_{\varphi,f} \cap (-\infty)) = \frac{1}{2}\dim(M_{\varphi,f} \cap (-\infty, t))$$

is continuous.

Since Proposition 2.10 says that $d_s(t) = D_s(t) = D_u(t) = d_u(t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the proof of Theorem 1.2 is complete.

References

[CF] T. Cusick and M. Flahive, The Markoff and Lagrange spectra, *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*, **30**. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1989. x+97 pp.

[HP] S. Hersonsky and F. Paulin, Diophantine approximation for negatively curved manifolds, *Math. Z.* **241** (2002), no. 1, 181-226.

[HPS] M. Hirsch, C Pugh and M. Shub, Invariant manifolds. *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, Vol. **583**. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1977. ii+149 pp.

[Mo1] C. G. Moreira, Geometric properties of the Markov and Lagrange spectra, Preprint available at http://preprint.impa.br/visualizar?id=5807

[Mo2] C. G. Moreira, Geometric properties of images of cartesian products of regular Cantor sets by differentiable real maps, Preprint (2016)

[MoRo] C. G. Moreira and S. Romaña, On the Lagrange and Markov dynamical spectra, Preprint (2013) available at arXiv:1310.3903, to appear in *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*

[PT] J. Palis and F. Takens, Hyperbolicity and sensitive chaotic dynamics at homoclinic bifurcations. *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*, **35**. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993. x+234 pp. ISBN: 0-521-39064-8.

Aline Cerqueira: IMPA, Instituto de Matemática Pura e Aplicada, Estrada Dona Castorina, Jardim Botânico, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, CEP 22460-320, Brazil.

E-mail address: alineagc@gmail.com

Carlos Matheus: Université Paris 13, Sorbonne Paris Cité, LAGA, CNRS (UMR 7539), F-93439, Villetaneuse, France

E-mail address: matheus.cmss@gmail.com

Carlos G. Moreira: IMPA, Instituto de Matemática Pura e Aplicada, Estrada Dona Castorina, Jardim Botânico, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, CEP 22460-320, Brazil.

E-mail address: gugu@impa.br